

Originating Committee: Tank Waste Committee

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Gerry Pollet, Jeff Burright, Bob Suyama, Shelley Cimon, Amber Waldref, Marissa Merker, Susan Leckband, Liz Mattson, Pam Larsen, Richard Bloom

Version #: 6

Date Revised: 2/2/2022

Color: ☐ Pink ☐ Yellow ☐ Green ☐ Buff ☐ Purple ☐ Blue ☐ Goldenrod

Letter Heading:

To: [Names, titles, and organizations, as appropriate] – Check boxes on last page for distribution

Subject: Responding to Leaking High-Level Radioactive Waste Tanks

Background:

The April 29, 2021 announcement of a new active leak in Hanford’s Single Shell High-Level Nuclear Waste Tank (SST) B-109 reminded the Hanford Advisory Board (Board) that the SSTs are long past their designed life and will likely continue to develop new leaks in the future. Current estimates¹ are that 3.37 million gallons of leakable liquid still reside in the SSTs, despite a previous campaign decades ago to remove the majority of the pumpable liquid into double shell tanks. At the time of the initiation of that previous campaign, the anticipated completion of SST retrievals was 2018. Now, per System Plan 9 the completion of tank retrievals is projected to be 2061, and the completion of all tank waste treatment is projected to be 2066.

The remaining drainable liquid in SSTs contains a significant inventory of soluble chemicals and radionuclides that have the potential to move through the vadose zone into the groundwater aquifer and then into the Columbia River. Remediation of additional or new contaminants in the vadose zone or groundwater underlying the Central Plateau resulting from SST leakage would add to the long-term management burden, schedule, and cost to cleanup the Central Plateau.

“Do no harm during cleanup” is a value that has been held by the Hanford Advisory Board since its inception in 1994. More SSTs are certain to leak during the next four decades. Allowing them to leak unabated while they await their turn for retrieval is inconsistent with the values and expectations of all Hanford stakeholders as well as the Hanford Advisory Board.

The Board believes as a policy that a more organized, consistent, and timely approach to identifying and proactively abating leaking single-shell tanks is critical. Tanks are leaking now and will inevitably leak in the future. The need for a plan is urgent. Accordingly, the Board offers the following advice.

¹ <https://pdw.hanford.gov/document/AR-14788>

Originating Committee: Tank Waste Committee

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Gerry Pollet, Jeff Burright, Bob Suyama, Shelley Cimon, Amber Waldref, Marissa Merker, Susan Leckband, Liz Mattson, Pam Larsen, Richard Bloom

Advice:

- 1) **The Board believes the agencies should remove all liquid waste, including the interstitial liquids from the SSTs as soon as possible, before they have a chance to leak into the environment, contaminating the water table and potentially the Columbia River.**
- 2) **Develop a comprehensive long-term plan to address Leak Detection, Characterization, Mitigation, Cleanup, and Communication.** Certain key elements of The Plan are advised below.

- a) **The Plan should include input from the public, Tribes, EPA, and State of Washington.**
- b) **Timely Assessment and Communication of Tank Leaks.** When a leak occurs in the future, timely assessment and communication is essential. The assessment must include the determination of risk to human health and ecological receptors from potential contaminants of concern in the leaking fluids, and that risk must be communicated to the public in a clear and understandable manner. The lead regulatory agency should be involved as soon as a leak is suspected.

For example the assessment could include, but not be limited to, the following:

- The magnitude of the leak.
 - The composition of the leak.
 - How long it will take potential contaminants of concern to move through the vadose zone to groundwater using an appropriate modeling code such as STOMP.
 - The magnitude (mass, percent, etc.) of the leak that will be transported to groundwater in a given amount of time, and determining the magnitude of the leak that will remain in the vadose zone in that given amount of time.
 - The length of time it will take potential contaminants of concern to reach the Columbia River by movement through the groundwater aquifer system using an appropriate modeling code such as MODFLOW.
 - The risk to human health or the environment using standard CERCLA baseline risk assessment methodology as has been employed in the recent risk assessment of Waste Management Area C⁶ and determining for radionuclides the dose impact to human health using the methodology employed in the current composite analysis project⁷.
 - The Plan should specifically evaluate the potential cumulative risk from the entire 3.37 million gallons of single-shell tank interstitial liquids if they were to leak before removal of all wastes from SSTs. This risk assessment may support prioritization of SST leak response planning actions.
- c) **Timely Response to Tank Leaks.** The Board states as a policy that responding to tank leaks through abatement or mitigation actions to the extent necessary and feasible must

not be delayed by lengthy processes. The public should be afforded a formal comment opportunity on those response options.

d) Assess the Feasibility of Current and Potential Future Abatement Technologies that address:

- Effectiveness and implementability of alternative abatement technologies;
- Costs to develop and implement (similar to cost profiles in System Plan 9);
- Budget profile effects; and
- Disposition pathways

The outcome of this additional analysis should clarify technological and policy solutions to address both B-109 and the risk of future SST leaks and feed into broader formal planning.

- e) Develop Abatement Technologies.** A long-time value of the Hanford Advisory Board is to develop and deploy new technology, without impeding cleanup activities. Further, cleanup should move forward using the most practicable, timely, available technology, while leaving room for future innovation. Accordingly, the Board advises DOE to invest in and support technologies to proactively mitigate tank leaks or to mitigate the spread of waste into the surrounding vadose zone once they have leaked.

The Board recommends that new technologies focus on addressing both drainable interstitial liquids inside the tanks and adding barriers outside tanks to slow the spread of the leaked radioactive material. The Board is specifically interested to see analysis of enhanced salt well pumping, application of the TBI/TSCR concept to extracted interstitial tank liquids, and/or onsite storage options for interstitial liquids once highly radioactive constituents are removed. The Board supports a pilot test of enhanced salt well pumping in an SST as proposed in the December 2020 letter from Ecology to DOE².

- f) Allocate Budget for Managing SST Leaks.** The Board advises DOE to use a budget line item to fund the development and maintenance of SST leak mitigation and abatement. This gives DOE greater budget flexibility to respond to future SST leaks. The Board sees value in having a team that is equipped and trained to proactively remove SST liquids and respond to emerging leaks.

² <https://pdw.hanford.gov/document/AR-04419>

Originating Committee: Tank Waste Committee

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Gerry Pollet, Jeff Burright, Bob Suyama, Shelley Cimon, Amber Waldref, Marissa Merker, Susan Leckband, Liz Mattson, Pam Larsen, Richard Bloom

Appendix: Supporting Background Context

This appendix contains the informed thinking that supported development of the advice.

The April 29, 2021 announcement of leaking SST B-109 came after two years of assessment and study. Current estimates show 13,000 to 15,000 gallons of drainable liquid remaining that may take anywhere from a few to a dozen years before the liquid drains completely into the soil. Due to suspected ongoing water infiltration into the tank, it may continue to release to the environment until it is retrieved. Under current planning, retrieval of this tank would not begin until the year 2043.

In public forums, DOE has said that it would prefer to take no additional action to stem the leak of SST B-109. DOE has referred to the amount of contamination leaking from B-109 as “small” in comparison to contamination which was previously discharged or leaked from tanks and cribs in the same area. While it is expected that contamination from the B-109 tank leak would begin to reach groundwater in 20-25 years and be captured by the pump and treat system, it would continue to add contamination to the groundwater long into the future.

We understand that there are no transfer lines attached to B-109, and putting lines in place would be expensive and potentially pull funding away from tank waste treatment. However, inaction goes against the Board’s “do no harm” value and defies legal requirements to act, by withdrawing leaking tanks from service, and draining as much liquid waste as necessary to stop the leak immediately or as soon as feasible³. In 2013, when the SST T-111 was similarly declared to be leaking, Washington’s Governor announced that the State has a “Zero Tolerance” policy for new tank leaks. Board Advice 271⁴ advised DOE to, “remove the drainable liquid from Single-Shell Tanks, focusing first on leaking tanks.” We do hope that DOE will pursue technologies, such as removal of only the interstitial leakable liquid without the need for transfer lines, that will address tank leaks to prevent waste materials from moving through the soil towards groundwater.

Based on the Monthly Waste Tank Summary Report from May 2021⁵, there are approximately 3.37 million gallons of drainable interstitial liquid and supernatant still contained across all of the SSTs (6% of the 56 million total gallons of waste in the Hanford tanks). Current estimates are that it will be over four decades before the last SST is retrieved. More tanks are certain to leak. The Board believes an actionable/implementable plan is needed, encompassing development

³ “A tank system... from which there has been a leak or spill... must be removed from service immediately.” WAC 173-303-640(7). “[i]f the release was from the tank system, the owner/operator must, within twenty-four hours after detection of the leak or, if the owner/operator demonstrates that it is not possible, at the earliest practicable time, remove as much of the waste as is necessary to prevent further release of dangerous waste to the environment.” WAC173-303-640(7)(b)(i).

⁴ https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/HABAdv_271.pdf

⁵ <https://pdw.hanford.gov/document/AR-14788>

Originating Committee: Tank Waste Committee

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Gerry Pollet, Jeff Burright, Bob Suyama, Shelley Cimon, Amber Waldref, Marissa Merker, Susan Leckband, Liz Mattson, Pam Larsen, Richard Bloom

of the tools and risk management response strategies necessary for safeguarding human health and the environment from the release of these liquid wastes.

The Board notes the 2020 Hanford SST Liquid Retrieval Study⁶ found that enhanced saltwell pumping was tied as the top contender for methods to remove additional interstitial liquid from a tank. Successfully used at the Savannah River Site to remove interstitial liquid from their tanks, it was highly rated in the 2020 study for its design maturity and likelihood of success. In response to the study, Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) proposed⁷ that DOE pursue pilot projects implementing the top two technologies in an actual Hanford tank. This proposal was suggested before it was known that B-109 had formally become an active leaker. The Board champions a pilot project, as it seems a worthy goal to try to add a new liquid removal capability to the tool set at Hanford. It could proactively prevent harm to the environment if deployed in tanks with high release potential.

The Board also observes that the Test Bed Initiative (TBI) proposes to use an in-tank pump with integrated pretreatment, followed by offsite disposal of the resulting low activity waste⁸. The Board would like to see a formal assessment of whether simple adjustments can make this concept compatible with enhanced saltwell pumping of SST interstitial liquid to allow offsite disposal of that portion of the tank waste that is presently at the highest risk of reaching the environment.

6 <https://pdw.hanford.gov/document/AR-04274>

7 <https://pdw.hanford.gov/document/AR-04419>

8 https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/Final_TWC_TBIPhasell_010919.pdf

Originating Committee: Tank Waste Committee

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Gerry Pollet, Jeff Burright, Bob Suyama, Shelley Cimon, Amber Waldref, Marissa Merker, Susan Leckband, Liz Mattson, Pam Larsen, Richard Bloom

References:

1. Hanford Advisory Board Advice #271, “Leaking Tanks (HAB Consensus Advice #271), dated September 6, 2013; https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/HABAdv_271.pdf
2. Single-Shell Tanks Liquid Retrieval Study, KA White, May 2020; <https://pdw.hanford.gov/document/AR-04274>
3. Department of Ecology’s Review of Single-Shell Tank Liquids Retrieval Study, RPP-RPT-62098, Rev. 0, and Fulfillment of Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) Milestone M-045-093, Jeffery J. Lyon, December 8, 2020; <https://pdw.hanford.gov/document/AR-04419>
4. Hanford Tank Waste Strategy – Test Bed Initiative-Phase II, DOE Office of River Protection, January 9, 2019; https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/Final_TWC_TBIPhasell_010919.pdf
5. Waste Tank Summary Report for Month Ending May 31, 2021, HNF-EP-0182 Rev 401, A.M. Templeton, July 13, 2021; <https://pdw.hanford.gov/document/AR-14788>
6. Risk Assessment of Contaminated Soils and Vadose Zone Sediments at Waste Management Area C at the Hanford Site, Southeast Washington. RPP-RPT-58329, Revision 3, January 2021.
7. Vadose Zone Model for B Complex for Composite Analysis. ECF-Hanford-19-0039, September, 2020.

Attachments:

- Leaking Tanks Advice #298, September 20, 2018: https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/HAB_Advice_298.pdf
- Leaking Tanks Advice #271, September 06, 2013: https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/HABAdv_271.pdf.
- DOE Response to Advice #271: https://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/HAB_ORP_Response271.pdf

Originating Committee: Tank Waste Committee

Issue Manager Team & Authors: Gerry Pollet, Jeff Burright, Bob Suyama, Shelley Cimon, Amber Waldref, Marissa Merker, Susan Leckband, Liz Mattson, Pam Larsen, Richard Bloom

CC/BCC:

☐ **TPA Agency Representatives**

- ☐ Ike White, DOE-EM
- ☐ Todd Shrader, DOE-EM
- ☐ Brian Vance, DOE
- ☐ Stanley Branch, DOE
- ☐ Gary Younger, DOE
- ☐ Roberto Armijo, EPA
- ☐ Laura Buelow, EPA
- ☐ Ryan Miller, ECY
- ☐ Ginger Wireman, ECY

☐ **Site-Specific Advisory Boards**

- ☐ Savannah River Site Citizens Advisory Board
- ☐ Nevada Site Specific Advisory Board
- ☐ Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory Board
- ☐ Paducah Citizens Advisory Board
- ☐ Oak Ridge Site Specific Advisory Board
- ☐ Idaho Cleanup Board
- ☐ Portsmouth Site Specific Advisory Board
- ☐ Kelly Snyder, DFO

☐ **OR/WA Congressional Delegations (to Chief of Staff)**

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sen. Patty Murray, WA | <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Adam Smith, WA-09 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Senator Maria Cantwell, WA | <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Marilyn Strickland, WA-10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Suzan DelBene, WA-01 | <input type="checkbox"/> Sen. Ron Wyden, OR |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Rick Larsen, WA-02 | <input type="checkbox"/> Sen. Jeff Merkley, OR |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Jaime Herrera Beutler, WA-03 | <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Suzanne Bonamici, OR-01 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Dan Newhouse, WA-04 | <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Cliff Bentz, OR-02 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Cathy McMorris Rodgers, WA-05 | <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Earl Blumenauer, OR-03 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Derek Kilmer, WA-06 | <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Peter DeFazio, OR-04 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Pramila Jayapal, WA-07 | <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Kurt Schrader, OR-05 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rep. Kim Schrier, WA-08 | |

☐ **Write-in/Additional**

<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	

☐ **Requests to Receive Advice**

- ☐ Jessica Keys